

REMARKS

The present application has been carefully studied and amended in view of the outstanding Office Action dated June 25, 2004, and reconsideration of that Action is requested in view of the following comments.

A supplemental Information Disclosure Statement is submitted herewith for the purpose of providing a copy of the non-patent literature identified on the initially filed Statement.

Pursuant to the Examiner's request, a simple drawing has been prepared and filed in the present application. Additionally, brief and detailed descriptions of the drawings have been submitted. It is believed that the drawing is fully supported by the application as originally filed and that no new matter is included.

The specification has been further amended to include subheadings, where appropriate.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention defined in claims 1-17 is neither shown nor suggested by the prior art taken along or in combination with one another. Specifically, claims 1-15 and 17 are not anticipated by Hoppe et al US 6,575,371 ("Hoppe") and claim 16 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Hoppe and Becker et al 4,765,656 ("Becker"), for the following reasons.

The various figures of Hoppe relied upon in the rejection clearly show that the optional chip 8 or 17 is always in an external position. Although the chip is covered on one side, the opposite side is not covered by a seal or a foil. Accordingly, the present invention is clearly different from Hoppe in that the chip is covered on both sides with a

seal or a plastic layer and this is considered an important feature of the present invention.

Moreover, Hoppe does not suggest the present invention in that there is no hint or motivation to cover both sides of the chip. The method disclosed by Hoppe is not suitable for a cover on both sides of the chip since Hoppe clearly teaches introducing the chip into a pre-produced card having a gap, as explained in column 2, lines 36-39 and column 3, lines 57-60.

The significant advantage of the present invention is that the chip is covered on both sides with a seal or plastic layer, and as such the chip cannot be manipulated or exchanged. In order to prevent tampering by reversible delamination of the foil or seal away from the core of the card, it has been found very effective to provide the recess and/or the seal with fine structure that easily tears apart when improperly manipulated.

Accordingly, for all of these reasons the claims herein clearly distinguish over Hoppe in that the structure defined in these claims is not disclosed or suggested by Hoppe for the above reasons.

Claim 16 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Hoppe and Becker for the same reasons discussed above and also because Becker does not address the deficiencies of the Hoppe reference. Moreover, the welding suggested by Becker at column 7, lines 7-12, column 9, lines 62-64 and column 12, lines 12-16, is directed to the complete layer whereas the welding recited in claim 16 is directed to the laterally projecting margins 7a and 7b that provide additional security in that delamination is made more difficult. For these reasons, claim 16 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Hoppe and Becker.

The application is now believed to be in condition for allowance and early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By Richard M. Beck

Richard M. Beck

Registration No.: 22,580

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

1007 North Orange Street

P.O. Box 2207

Wilmington, Delaware 19899

(302) 658-9141

(302) 658-5614 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant

351505